

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the December 11, 2008 Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the invention. Claims 1-2, 5-11, 13-14, 17, 20-22, 25, 27-36 and 39 are presented in the application for further examination. Claims 1, 14, 22 and 36 have been amended by this Amendment D. Claim 12 has been canceled by this Amendment D. Reconsideration of the application claims as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Drawings

Applicants request that the Examiner now have the drawings as originally filed reviewed and accepted.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 5-14, 17, 20-22, 25, 27-36 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,133,869 (hereinafter "Bryan"). Applicants respectfully disagree, as the amended claims recite a combination of elements not disclosed or suggested by Bryan.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a method of generating notifications in a notifications system, where the notifications system is configured to provide notifications, containing content provided by one or more content providers, to subscribers via a data communications network, said method comprising, among other things:

receiving a parameter-driven template from a *content provider*, said template relating to a category specified by the content provider, said template containing one or more parameters specified by the content provider, said parameters defining a plurality of events specified by the content provider and relating to the specified category, each of said events comprising a recurring event specified by the content provider, said parameters relating to a subscription for notifications and specifying a predefined scheduled time for the generation of notifications to occur;

enabling a *notifications application* based on the received template, said notifications application mapping the latest recurring event of the specified category to one or more subscribers as a function of the parameters specified by the content provider, wherein enabling the notifications application based on the received template includes **creating an application definition file that describes the notifications application;** and

executing the notifications application on a recurring basis to generate a notification in accordance with the predefined scheduled time specified by the received parameter-driven template parameters, wherein the notification is generated based on matching the latest recurring event of the specified category with subscribers of the specified category, and wherein **the generated notification is delivered to the subscribers of the specified category on a recurring basis in accordance with the user-specified predefined scheduled time defined by the received parameter-driven template parameters.**

The method of claim 1 recites receiving a template from a content provider, such as an alerts service, where the template contains one or more parameters specified by the content provider and relates to a subscription for notifications. (Specification, [0031]; Fig. 3, element 304). Fig. 3 of the present Specification illustrates one example embodying aspects of amended independent claim 1. Upon receiving the parameter-driver template from a content provider (element 304), **a notifications application is enabled based on the received template**, where the notifications application maps the latest recurring event of the specified category to subscribers as a function of the parameters specified by the content provider. Enabling the notifications application based on the received templates includes, as recited in claim1, "creating an application definition file that describes the notifications application". The application definition file ("ADF") permits the notifications system to, among other things, enable the ADF-based notifications application without the need to implement new computer code for each notifications application. (Specification, [0031]). The method of amended independent claim 1 additionally recites executing the notifications application (Fig. 3, element 308) to generate a notification "in response to the recurring event and to deliver the notification to the subscribers". (Specification, [0033]). As recited, the notification is *generated* in accordance with "the predefined scheduled time specified by the received parameter-driven template parameters", where the notification is generated based on matching the latest recurring event of the specified category with subscribers of the category specified. The notification is *delivered* to the subscribers of the specified category "in accordance with the *user-specified* predefined scheduled time defined by the received parameter-driven template parameters". In other words, delivery of the generated notifications occurs "at a user-defined, scheduled predetermined time of day." (Specification, [0032]). The method of amended independent claim 1 permits content providers to focus on aggregating, transforming, editorializing, and publishing rich content and

relieves the content providers of the burden of managing user's content subscriptions and generating notifications. (Specification, [0034]).

Applicants submit that Bryan fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of amended independent claim 1. The Examiner argues that Bryan discloses the method of claim 1. As indicating in its Abstract, Bryan teaches methods and systems for defining and distributing information alerts include presenting a user with a series of templates that allows the user to define security events. Intended alert recipients are presented with templates that allow the individuals to input contact and schedule information for receiving the information alerts. (Abstract). A knowledge switch then uses the security event definitions in conjunction with the contact and schedule information to detect events and distribute the information alerts to the intended recipients when an event occurs. (Abstract). The information alerts include directives that instruct intended recipients regarding action to be taken in response to a security event. (Abstract).

Applicants submit that Bryan does not disclose receiving a **parameter-driven template from a content provider**, as recited in amended independent claim 1. The Examiner argues that Bryan (at Fig. 1, label 116; col. 3, lines 7–10; col. 5, lines 42–55) discloses receiving a template from a content provider. However, in these cited portions, Bryan discloses providing templates to "end users", for example, at col. 5, line 44. As described in Bryan, "end users" are the recipients of notifications when an event or series of events occur (Bryan, col. 5, lines 6–7), and therefore cannot simultaneously be "content providers". Bryan further states that its invention "allows an administrator to define the type of templates that are available to *end users*" (Bryan, col. 5, lines 61–63), in effect teaching away from a method that includes "receiving a parameter-driven template from a content provider", as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Further, the Examiner argues that Bryan discloses or suggests that the template parameters specified by the content provider relate to a subscription for notifications and specifying a predefined scheduled time for the notifications to occur. However, the cited portions of Bryan fail to disclose or suggest these elements. Bryan discloses in col. 10, lines 14–34, as cited by the Examiner, a **scheduling** template as a separate template that is accessible from an end user contact template, allowing an end user to associate schedule information, such as time of day, with a contact profile that includes contact information applicable for that time of time. As indicated in Bryan, "[p]roviding an easy-to-use interface that allows a user to associate

contact information with the time of data increases the likelihood that an alert will reach the user because the user is more likely to keep his or her contact information current." (Bryan, col. 10, lines 28–32). In other words, the scheduling template is specified by an **end-user** to ensure alert delivery using appropriate contact information, unlike the **content provider-specified parameters** of amended independent claim 1, "said parameters relating to a subscription for notifications and specifying a predefined **scheduled time for the generation of notifications** to occur". As such, Bryan fails to disclose or suggest **parameters** permitting a **content provider** to specify a schedule for the generation of notifications.

Additionally, the Examiner argues that Bryan discloses enabling a notifications application based on the received template at Fig. 1, label 102 and col. 5, lines 2–9. However, Fig. 1, label 102 refers to the "logic kernel" of the "Knowledge Switch Configurator" of the "Knowledge Switch", with col. 5, lines 2–9 describing the functionality including detecting or allowing the documentation of the occurrence of events and notifying end users when an event or series of events occur. According to Bryan, an important aspect of the invention is the ability to configure the "Knowledge Switch" by utilizing templates. (Bryan, col. 5, lines 36–38). As described in Bryan, these templates are utilized to control the operation of the Knowledge Switch to provide a multitude of types of information, using templates such as those shown in Fig. 1, elements 116–136, i.e. Bryan describes an invention where the templates are processed by a general "logic kernel" 102 to control the "Knowledge Switch". Bryan fails to disclose or suggest enabling a notifications application based on the received template, where enabling includes creating an application definition file that describes the notifications application as recited in amended independent claim 1. In this manner, one or more notifications applications "based of the received template" can operate at once as recited in amended claim 1. As noted in the Specification, "[t]hus, applications may be completely defined through metadata described in [the] application definition file []. Additional code need not be written once the basic code is written to handle applications and the corresponding scenario templates []. This is the key to delivering **many alerting applications** quickly without custom coding, testing, and deployment." (Specification, [0028]). Since Bryan describes a general-purpose logic kernel to process its control templates, it fails to disclose or suggest enabling notifications applications based on a received template.

The Examiner also argues Bryan discloses that the generated notification is delivered to the subscribers of the specified category on a recurring basis in accordance with the predefined scheduled time defined by the received parameter-driven template parameters. However, amended independent claim recites that "the generated notification is delivered to the subscribers of the specified category on a recurring basis in accordance with the *user-specified* predefined scheduled time defined by the received parameter-driven template parameters". (*See also* Specification, [0032]). Bryan at col. 10, lines 14–34, describes the end-user definable scheduling template as noted above. This functionality, however, does not direct the "logic kernel" in Bryan to send alerts at predefined scheduled times, but instead indicates the contact information that corresponds to the time of day an alert is being delivered. In Bryan, the user does not control the time of delivery, but only the **contact information used to deliver the alert**, and therefore does not anticipate these elements of amended independent claim 1.

Finally, it is noted that amended claim 1 presents the subject matter of claim 12 in independent form. Regarding claim 12, the Examiner argues as follows:

As claim 12, Bryan further teaches enabling the notifications application based on the received template includes creating an application definition file that describes the notifications application (fig. label 100; col. 4, lines 62-67; col. 5, lines 1-9; fig. 2, labels 100, 200, 202, 204, 208, 210, 212; col. 6, lines 4-22).

However, Bryan does not disclose or suggest creating an application definition file that describes the notifications application. As indicated above, Bryan does not disclose delivering many notifications applications, but instead discloses a general-purpose logic kernel that processes the templates, i.e. the templates are processed by the same logic kernel. Amended claim 1 recites, among other things, creating an application definition file that describes the notifications applications, such that "applications may be completely defined through metadata described in application definition file" and many alerting applications can be delivered quickly utilizing the application definition file. (Specification, [0028]). Since Bryan does not contemplate utilizing the templates beyond controlling the operation of the general-purpose logic kernel (see above), Bryan fails to disclose or suggest this element of amended independent claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that amended independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 5–11 and 13 are patentable for at least the reasons given above and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejects independent claims 14, 22 and 36 for the same essential reasons given for the rejection of independent claim 1. Applicants submit that independent claims 14, 22 and 36 are patentable for at least the same reasons given for the allowance of amended independent claim 1 and as such, the rejection of amended independent claim 14, its dependent claims 17 and 20–21, amended independent claim 22, its dependent claims 25 and 27–35, amended independent claim 36 and its dependent claim 39 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank R. Agovino/

Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416
SENNIGER POWERS LLP
100 North Broadway, 17th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 345-7000